



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/778,031	02/17/2004	Hung Hsiang Hsu	MR3003-212	6167
<div>4586 7590 04/04/2008</div> <div>ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE</div> <div>3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101</div> <div>ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043</div>				
EXAMINER				
BURROWES, LAWRENCE J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2619				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/778,031

Applicant(s)

HSU, HUNG HSIANG

Examiner

LAWRENCE J. BURROWES

Art Unit

2619

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12 and 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/30/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Read (WO/2002/11400) in view of Moyer et al (2002/0103898) hereafter Moyer.

For claim 1, Read discloses a routing protocol device integrated with SIP call server (see Figure 1 Box 40 and Page 12 lines 18-21, proxy server between two networks), the routing protocol device being provided between first and second network systems (see Figure 1 Box 2 and 4, Enterprise A and Enterprise B), the SIP call server being a Session Initiation Protocol architecture (see Page 11 lines 1-22, SIP) which can be coupled with a plurality of remote SIP agent client

devices (see Figure 1 Box 2 and 4, Enterprise A and Enterprise B and its terminals), the routing protocol device comprising:

a first connecting port coupled with the first network system (see Figure 1 Box 40 and Page 12 lines 18-21, proxy server connected by and interface to Enterprise A);

a second connecting port coupled with the second network system (see Figure 1 Box 40 and Page 12 lines 18-21, proxy server connected by and interface to Enterprise B); and

a data packet processing module electrically connected to the first and second connecting ports, the data packet processing module including:

(a) routing protocol means for selecting a data packet transmission path of the first and second network systems (see Page 21 lines 10-25, when a call is placed the packets are processed by the server in order to route them to the proper terminal on either Enterprise A or B);

(b) a SIP registry server for registering the remote SIP agent client devices and thereby stores an SIP URI of the remote SIP agent client devices (see Figure 1 Box 40 and page 19 line 14 – page 20 line 23, SIP servo program is the device acting as a SIP proxy server which registers the terminal and stores the address).

Read disclose all the limitation of the claimed invention except (c) an SIP location server for seeking the location of the remote SIP agent client device and convert the location into the SIP URI of the remote SIP agent, whereby the

remote SIP agent client devices can directly bidirectionally telecommunicate with each other by voice; and

(d) an SIP proxy server for transmitting an INVITE message send from one remote SIP agent client device to another remote SIP agent client device to initiate a voice phone call.

Moyer from the same or similar field of endeavor teaches (c) an SIP location server for seeking the location of the remote SIP agent client device and convert the location into the SIP URI of the remote SIP agent, whereby the remote SIP agent client devices can directly bidirectionally telecommunicate with each other by voice (see Paragraph 0015-0018, the redirect server maps the addresses of the clients so they can communicate through the proxy server); and (d) an SIP proxy server for transmitting an INVITE message send from one remote SIP agent client device to another remote SIP agent client device to initiate a voice phone call (see Paragraph 0014 and 0017, SIP proxy server send INVITE messages in order to create sessions).

Regarding claim 2, wherein the first and second network systems are Internets or LAN (see Read Figure 1 Box 2 and 4, Enterprise A and Enterprise B are LANs).

Regarding claim 3, wherein the first network system is coupled with a first remote SIP agent client device (see Read Figure 1 Box 10 and Page 12 lines 18-21, Enterprise A LAN is connected to a terminal), while the second network

system is coupled with a second remote SIP agent client device (see Figure 1 Box 12 and Page 12 lines 18-21, Enterprise B LAN is connected to a terminal).

Regarding claim 4, wherein the first and second remote SIP agent client devices are computer mainframes for converting voice signal into digital signal or converting digital signal into voice signal for bidirectional voice telecommunication (see Read Figure 1 Box 10 and 12 and Page 1 lines 7-19, the computers transfers voice, video and data service between each other).

Regarding claim 5, wherein the remote SIP agent client device is a computer mainframe, a network hub, an IP phone gateway or a PSTN gateway (see Figure 1 Box 10 and 12 and Page 1 lines 7-19, the computers/PSTN transfers voice, video and data services between each other).

Regarding claim 6, wherein the routing protocol means selects the data packet transmission path of the first network system via the first connecting port (see Read Page 21 lines 10-25, when a call is placed the packets are processed by the server in order to route them to the proper terminals port on either Enterprise A or B).

Regarding claim 7, wherein the routing protocol means selects the data packet transmission path of the second network system via the second connecting port (see Read Page 21 lines 10-25, when a call is placed the packets are processed by the server in order to route them to the proper terminals port on either Enterprise A or B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify/implement the SIP registrar, proxy or redirect server of Moyer into the VOIP system of Read by programming the proxy server to act as a registrar. The motivation to do so would be in order to enhance security for call access from outside the home location.

4. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Read in view of the official notice

For claims 12 and 13, Read disclose the microprocessor unit including the routing protocol means, the SIP registry server, the SIP location server and the SIP proxy server (see Page 19 lines 14-20, SIP registrar, proxy and location server).

Read disclose all the limitations of the claimed invention except the data packet processing module includes: a microprocessor unit; and a ROM memory unit electrically connected with the microprocessor unit for storing program to implement the SIP registry server, the SIP location server, and the SIP proxy server, the URI of the remote SIP agent client and the data packet to be transmitted.

Examiner takes official notice a routing device has a CPU connected to memory to store the program, which is a microprocessor unit that would execute programs stored in memory.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify/implement the CPU and memory into the VOIP system of Read. The motivation to do so would be so that any available processor and memory combination could be used to lower the cost of the system.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see page 6, filed 4 February 2008, with respect to the objection has been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of claims 11 has been withdrawn.
6. Applicant's arguments filed 4 February 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments on pages 6-10, the applicant argued that Read fails to teach (a) routing protocol means for selecting a data packet transmission path of the first and second network;

(b) a SIP registry server for registering the remote SIP agent client devices and thereby stores an SIP URI of the remote SIP agent client devices;

(c) an SIP location server for seeking the location of the remote SIP agent client device and convert the location into the SIP URI of the remote SIP agent, whereby the remote SIP agent client devices can directly bidirectionally telecommunicate with each other by voice; and

(d) a SIP proxy server for transmitting an INVITE message send from one remote SIP agent client device to another remote SIP agent client device to initiate a voice phone call. The examiner respectfully disagrees with a portion of the argument. Read does not teach limitations (c) and (d), but Read does teach (a) and (b). Moyer discloses the deficiencies that Read fails on and that is limitations (c) and (d). Read discloses limitation (a) routing protocol means for selecting a data packet transmission path of the first and second network systems. If the applicant would refer to Page 21 lines 10-25 of Read, which is interpreted as Read's terminal places a multimedia (voice/data) call and the packets are routed/registered by the proxy server in order to route them to the proper terminal on either Enterprise A or B depending on which terminal is initiating the multimedia call. Read discloses limitation (b) a SIP registry server for registering the remote SIP agent client devices and thereby stores an SIP URI of the remote SIP agent client devices. If the applicant would refer to Figure 1 Box 40 and page 19 line 14 – page 20 line 23 of Read, which is interpreted as the SIP registry server is the device acting as a SIP proxy server which registers the terminal and stores the address when a multimedia call is initiated. The examiner now combines the deficiencies of Read with the teaching of Moyer. Moyer teaches limitation (c) an SIP location server for seeking the location of the remote SIP agent client device and convert the location into the SIP URI of the remote SIP agent, whereby the remote SIP agent client devices can directly bidirectionally telecommunicate with each other by voice. If the applicant would

refer to Paragraph 0015-0018 of Moyer, which is interpreted as a user agent server that maps the addresses of the clients so communication of the terminals can begin through the proxy server. Moyer teaches limitation (d) a SIP proxy server for transmitting an INVITE message send from one remote SIP agent client device to another remote SIP agent client device to initiate a voice phone call. If applicant would refer to Paragraph 0014 and 0017 of Moyer, which is interpreted as the SIP user agent server sending INVITE request messages in order to create multimedia calls.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAWRENCE J. BURROWES whose telephone number is (571)270-1419. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 5:30am - 3pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. J. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2619

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619